

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,870,994 to Raymond.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raymond in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,480,654 to Firey.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raymond.

Claims 4-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The specification is objected to for informalities.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended the specification.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4.

Claims 1-7 are pending.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The specification is objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 4-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter recited in claims 4-7. Applicants have rewritten claim 4 in independent form. Claims 5-7 ultimately depend from claim 4, and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 4, as well as additional features that define over the applied art. Accordingly, claims 4-7 are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-7 is requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raymond. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raymond in view of Firey. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-3.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for outputting compressed air including an air tank storing compressed air at a high pressure, and a pressure adjusting portion connected to the air tank that adjusts a pressure value of the compressed air in a region from the high pressure to zero.

The Office Action relies on the built-in accumulator and the inlet valve 20 of Raymond for a teaching of an air tank storing compressed air at a high pressure and a pressure adjusting portion connected to the air tank, as recited in claim 1. However, the inlet valve 20 of Raymond does not adjust a pressure value of the air tank compressed air in a region from the high pressure to zero. As described at col. 2, line 59 – col. 3, line 1 of Raymond, air compressors have built-in accumulators and regulators for maintaining the air pressure within the built-in accumulator at a predetermined pressure. Normally, the air compressor is activated when the air pressure within the built-in accumulator reaches a predetermined low value and is deactivated when the air

pressure within the built-in accumulator reaches a predetermined high value. The inlet valve 20 is preferably set so that the pressure of air to the tank 12 is below the lowest predetermined pressure of the built-in accumulator. Because inlet valve 20 is set so that the pressure of air to the tank 12 is below the lowest predetermined pressure of the built-in accumulator, it is submitted that Raymond does not teach a pressure adjusting portion connected to the air tank that adjusts a pressure value of the air tank compressed air in a region from the high pressure to zero, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, there is no motivation to modify the inlet valve 20 of Raymond to adjust a pressure value of the compressed air in a region from the high pressure to zero because such a modification would render the apparatus of Raymond unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Because the inlet valve 20 is set so that the pressure of air to the tank 12 is below the lowest predetermined pressure of the built-in accumulator, the compressor 30 has a tendency to run longer during its running phase and the air pressure in tank 12 to all the tools 40 never falls below the predetermined operating pressure. (*See* col. 3, ll. 1-11). As discussed in M.P.E. P. § 2143.01, “[i]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).”

To the extent that the air accumulator 10 of Raymond may be considered to teach the air tank recited in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not teach or suggest at least the features of a pressure outputting portion connected to a secondary side of the pressure adjusting portion, as recited in claim 1. The inlet valve of Raymond is disposed upstream of the air accumulator 10.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Raymond does not teach or suggest a pressure outputting portion connected to the secondary side of the pressure adjusting portion and outputting the adjusted compressed air to at least one of a first pneumatic tool driven at a first pressure and a second pneumatic tool driven at a second pressure, wherein the first pressure is larger than the second pressure, and wherein the adjusted compressed air is not output to the second pneumatic tool at the first pressure, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that Firey fails to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Raymond. Specifically, Firey fails to teach or suggest at least a pressure adjusting portion connected to the air tank that adjusts a pressure value of the air tank compressed air in a region from the high pressure to zero, as recited in claim 1. Firey shows a multipressure compressor machine capable of delivering gas or vapor at several different discharge pressures from a single compressor which may be using suction gas or vapor also at several different pressures. (*See* Abstract).

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), of claim 1, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of claims 2-3, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: April 13, 2004

By: 

Peter J. Sistare

Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000